

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4- 9, 11-20, 22 and 24-26 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-26 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, to expedite prosecution of the current application, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 14 to recite “disabling access to the respective content” and “disable access to the respective content,” respectively. Applicants respectfully request removal of the § 112 rejection.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Holtz et al. (U.S. Patent 6,760,916) (hereinafter “Holtz”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

In regard to claim 1, Holtz fails to teach, while processing the request and subsequent to said streaming out the portion of content: determining if access to the portion of content or additional content referenced by the portion of content should be disabled, and in response to determining that access to the portion of content or the additional content should be disabled, disabling access to the respective content without terminating the session. The Examiner cites column 17, lines 6-36 and column 28, lines 4-48 of Holtz. However, Holtz fails to teach or suggest, in the cited art or elsewhere, the specific limitations of claim 1. In column 17, lines 6-36, Holtz describes a process for “providing an enhanced media viewer.” While Holtz does disclose “[a]t step

1504, enhanced media server 115 analyzes the client request to identify or authenticate the user” (column 17, lines 25-26), the identification of the user is used to determine whether the user should be provided with a standard viewer (*see e.g.*, block 1506 of Figure 15) or a customized viewer (*see e.g.*, block 1508 of Figure 15). Determining whether a user should be provided with a standard viewer or a customized viewer is not the same as *determining if access to the portion of content or additional content referenced by the portion of content should be disabled*, much less performing such a determination *while processing the request and subsequent to said streaming out the portion of content*. Moreover, the process described in column 17, lines 6 – 60 has nothing to do with *disabling access to a portion of content that has been streamed to a client*. Instead, column 17, lines 6-60 describes a process for *providing a client with a viewer*. Clearly, *providing a client with a viewer is not the same as* *disabling access to the respective content without terminating the session*.

In column 28, lines 4 – 48, Holtz describes a Graphical User Interface (GUI) for an encoding process. While Holtz does disclose that the GUI includes a stop control 708, the stop control is used to disable the streaming of content to streaming server 125 (*see e.g.*, column 28, lines 42 – 43). Holtz fails to mention anything at all about disabling access to a portion of content that has been streamed out to the client or disabling additional content referenced by the portion of content. In other words, claim 1 refers to disabling access to **a portion of content that has already been streamed to the client** (or additional data referenced by the portion of content). To the contrary, Holtz teaches “avoid[ing] airing any unauthorized content” (*see e.g.*, column 28, line 47). In other words, Holtz’s teachings refer to preventing the streaming of **portions of content that have not been streamed to the client**. Accordingly, Holtz fails to teach or suggest *in response to determining that access to the portion of content or the additional content should be disabled, disabling access to the respective content without terminating the session*. Similarly, since Holtz’s teachings refer to preventing the streaming of portions of content that *have not yet been streamed to the client*, Holtz fails to teach or suggest *determining if access to the portion of content or additional content referenced by the portion of content should be disabled*.

Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner that anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every limitation of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. M.P.E.P 2131; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The **identical invention** must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed above, Holtz clearly fails to teach the specific limitations of claim 1. Therefore, Holtz cannot be said to anticipate claim 1.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 2

Holtz fails to teach that said determining comprises detecting an occurrence of a security violation during said processing. The Examiner asserts Holtz teaches this limitation and cites column 17, lines 6-36 and column 28, lines 4-48. Neither column 17, lines 6-36 nor column 28, lines 4-48 mention anything at all about a security violation, much less detecting an occurrence of a security violation during said processing. While column 17, lines 6-36 does describe “analyzing a client request to identify or authenticate the user,” nowhere does Holtz teach or suggest anything at all about a security violation, much less detecting an occurrence of a security violation during said processing. In fact, Holtz describes that the purpose of identifying or authenticating the user is to determine whether to provide the client with a standard viewer or a customized viewer (*see e.g.*, Figure 15, blocks 1506-1508).

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 2 is unsupported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 5

Holtz fails to teach or suggest wherein said preventing comprises maintaining a lookup table of all hyperlinks associated with the content streamed to the client, and invalidating the hyperlinks by modifying said lookup table to redirect the hyperlinks to an error message. The Examiner asserts Holtz inherently teaches *invalidating the hyperlinks by modifying said lookup table to redirect the hyperlinks to an error message*. The Examiner further asserts “Holtz teaches using URL or Hyperlink for streaming” and “[w]hen URL or Hyperlink is not valid it redirects to error message.” First, the Examiner failed to provide any documentary evidence in support of his assertion that “[w]hen URL or Hyperlink is not valid it redirects to error message.” Additionally, irrespective of the correctness of the Examiner’s assertion, Holtz fails to teach or suggest *invalidating the hyperlinks by modifying said lookup table*. Nowhere does Holtz teach or suggest modifying a lookup table, much less invalidating hyperlinks by modifying a lookup table.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 5 is unsupported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 14

In regard to claim 14, Holtz fails to teach a content disabling mechanism configured to determine if access to the portion of content or additional content referenced by the portion of content should be disabled, wherein the content disabling mechanism is configured to perform said determining while processing said request and subsequent to said streaming out the portion of content, and if access to the portion of content or the additional content should be disabled, disable access to the respective content without terminating said session. The Examiner cites column 17, lines 6-36 and column 28, lines 4-48 of Holtz. However, Holtz fails to teach or suggest, in the cited art or elsewhere, the specific limitations of claim 14. In column 17, lines 6-36, Holtz describes a process for “providing an enhanced media viewer.”

While Holtz does disclose “[a]t step 1504, enhanced media server 115 analyzes the client request to identify or authenticate the user” (column 17, lines 25-26), the identification of the user is used to determine whether the user should be provided with a standard viewer (*see e.g.*, block 1506 of Figure 15) or a customized viewer (*see e.g.*, block 1508 of Figure 15). However, determining whether a user should be provided with a standard viewer or a customized viewer is not the same as *a content disabling mechanism configured to determine if access to the portion of content or additional content referenced by the portion of content should be disabled*, much less performing such a determination *while processing said request and subsequent to said streaming out the portion of content*. Moreover, the process described in column 17, lines 6 – 60 has nothing to do with *a content disabling mechanism configured to disable access to the respective content without terminating said session*. Instead, column 17, lines 6-60 describes a process for *providing a client with a viewer*. Clearly, *providing a client with a viewer is not the same as* *disabling access to the respective content without terminating said session*.

In column 28, lines 4 – 48, Holtz describes a Graphical User Interface (GUI) for an encoding process. While Holtz does disclose that the GUI includes a stop control 708, the stop control is used to disable the streaming of content to streaming server 125 (*see e.g.*, column 28, lines 42 – 43). Holtz fails to mention anything at all about disabling access to a portion of content that has been streamed out to the client or disabling additional content referenced by the portion of content. In other words, claim 14 refers to disabling access to **a portion of content that has already been streamed to the client** (or additional data referenced by the portion of content). To the contrary, Holtz teaches “avoid[ing] airing any unauthorized content” (*see e.g.*, column 28, line 47). In other words, Holtz’s teachings refer to preventing the streaming of **portions of content that have not been streamed to the client**. Accordingly, Holtz fails to teach or suggest *if access to the portion of content or the additional content should be disabled, the content disabling mechanism is configured to disable access to the respective content without terminating the session*. Similarly, since Holtz’s teachings refer to preventing the streaming of portions of content that *have not yet been streamed to the client*, Holtz fails to teach or suggest that *the content disabling mechanism is configured to determine if*

access to the portion of content or additional content referenced by the portion of content should be disabled.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 14 is clearly unsupported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 15

Holtz fails to teach or suggest wherein the content disabling mechanism is configured to determine that said access associated with the content should be disabled in response to an occurrence of a security violation during the processing of the request. The Examiner asserts Holtz teaches this limitation and cites column 17, lines 6-36 and column 28, lines 4-48. Neither column 17, lines 6-36 nor column 28, lines 4-48 mention anything at all about a security violation, much less determining that said access associated with the content should be disabled in response to an occurrence of a security violation during the processing of the request. While column 17, lines 6-36 does describe “analyzing a client request to identify or authenticate the user,” nowhere does Holtz teach or suggest anything at all about a security violation, much less determining that said access associated with the content should be disabled in response to an occurrence of a security violation during the processing of the request. In fact, Holtz describes that the purpose of identifying or authenticating the user is to determine whether to provide the client with a standard viewer or a customized viewer (*see e.g.*, Figure 15, blocks 1506-1508).

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 15 is unsupported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 18

Holtz fails to teach or suggest wherein to prevent a user from accessing content referenced by a hyperlink, the content disabling mechanism is configured to

maintain a lookup table of all hyperlinks associated with the content streamed to the client, and invalidate one or more of the hyperlinks by modifying said lookup table to redirect the one or more hyperlinks to an error message. The Examiner asserts Holtz inherently teaches this limitation. The Examiner further asserts “Holtz teaches using URL or Hyperlink for streaming” and “[w]hen URL or Hyperlink is not valid it redirects to error message.” First, the Examiner failed to provide any documentary evidence in support of his assertion that “[w]hen URL or Hyperlink is not valid it redirects to error message.” Additionally, irrespective of the correctness of the Examiner’s assertion, Holtz fails to teach or suggest *invalidating one or more of the hyperlinks by modifying said lookup table*. Nowhere does Holtz teach or suggest modifying a lookup table, much less invalidating hyperlinks by modifying a lookup table.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 18 is unsupported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-58400/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: July 2, 2007